

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/709,730

Applicant(s)

ZAZOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Shane Bomar

Art Unit

3672

**All Participants:**(1) Shane Bomar.(2) David Cate.**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8 December 2006**Time:** 10:15am**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*20 and 22*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Attorney Cate because it appeared as though claim 20 was claiming a redundant limitation since the prevention of forming conductive paths encompasses preventing electrical shorts. Mr. Cate agreed with my assessment, wherein it was agreed to cancel said claim and to change the dependency of claim 22 via an Examiner's Amendment.